**Greene Comprehensive Plan Committee**

**Meeting Minutes – Draft**

**January 3, 2024**

**Greene Town Office**

**Present:** Brent Armstrong (CEO), Julie Mondro (Chair), Lea Chouinard, Steve Creamer, George Farris Jr., Kevin Healy, Judy Marden, Brad Tuck

**Absent:** Amanda Leclerc

**1. Approval of Minutes of December 6, 2023**: Kevin moved to approve, George seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

**2. Organization:**

**a. Information:** Julie converted the existing Comprehensive Plan to a Word document, to enable editing.

**b. Ways to get things done:**

(1) Broadband Committee: Brent will talk with them about an electronic survey.

(2) Paper survey

(3) Historical Society: Julie and Judy will discuss

**3.** Julie suggested that we finish up the remaining pages in the Recommendations section. We began on P. 29.

**a. Capital Investment Plan:** Julie has summarized it, and passed out copies. Defined as “Public Improvements: expenditures greater than $10,000 that do not recur annually, have useful life greater than 3 years, and result in fixed assets.”

P. 30 contains “Current needs,” which are from 2000-2009. Kevin asked if we had a more current list, and Brent replied that we do, and it comes from the Town report every year. Some needs are always included—such as Highway reconstruction: Paving. Others are one time expenses—such as Highway Garage. Others keep returning: Fire Truck, highway garage equipment. Village sidewalk is mentioned in this list; we had discussed that. George said they had voted to get a grant to look into engineering studies up by the Town Garage to make a training field for the Fire Department. Those fields were once designated for ball fields. Discussion followed on ball fields and especially the fate of Mission Field and the use of the former Monastery.

Kevin brought up idea to have a swap area at the Transfer Station. He knows of other places where it is successful. Consensus was to put the idea in the survey. And also add hours and staffing for the Transfer Station: what do people want?

Brent said Greg Keene was the newly-hired Public Works Supervisor.

Discussion of Dams in town and eventual need for repairs: Sabattus Pond Dam, Allen Pond Dam should be included in new version of Comp Plan under “long term planning.”

P. 31: Brent will ask Sheldon to review it for updates.

P. 32-33: Generic definitions.

P. 32-36: Interlocal planning issues.

1. Already done.

2. a shared resource, the Androscoggin is recognized as important. When the 1999 Plan was written, the State Park didn’t exist. How does it impact Greene?

3. Where is the Lewiston line on College Road? Sawyer Road? If there is something in Greene that continues into an abutting town, we are supposed to have an interlocal agreement. For example the Amish driveway from Greene—Leeds—Greene.

Fire services?

4. Regional transportation--there are strategies, but we have local authority. What are the needs? Do we need buses? Do we want to be “North Lewiston?” What are the advantages—and repercussions—of actions?

Julie advised that we take out meaningless sections. Group decided we should remove regional approaches to economic development and regional transportation systems. We should leave only actionable items. The mission of Green is to be independent, but if regional opportunities occur, it is the responsibility of the Planning Board to explore them.

Brad added that many things span more than one town, and an environmental mess exists because we didn’t examine them together. When we come to an actual ordinance, we need to overlap and interface with other communities.

Brent: The Plan will guide the ordinances. We are not creating an ordinance here, we are creating an idea.

Kevin suggest an approach: 1) scan to be aware of what is going on, 2)analyze: does it pertain to Greene? 3) Turn it over to the Planning Board or other group to determine what to do. We must ask what are the resources that exist for supporting things, like, for example, a homeless shelter or group home in Greene. (They don’t have to notify anyone if they come to Greene, but may need extra support. Not well thought out before recommendations and decisions are made.) {“Need in the community” is different from “Not wanting certain people.”)

Lea observed that the cost per child in school has gone up astronomically, but it’s not driven by

increased population growth but by increased services needed by the children or mandates from the

state. We should be monitoring how it pertains to Greene and then who owns it.

Brad added that changes in needs arise from changes in demographics, not population growth. Some change is mandated by the State Dept. of Education, increasing what the School Departments are mandated to do. Many mandates are unfunded.

**Implementation Strategies: P35**

A1: Transportation: Can get from MDOT. COVID’s impact on commuting is real.

Brad mentioned income data. To compare 2010 with 2022you have to bring the amounts to 2022. Mean income stays flat until 2019, in 2020 a significant increase. Why? Does it mean a number of affluent people moved to Greene during COVID? The number of households increased; more single families, mobile homes went from 90 to >200. US Census unhelpful in category intervals…”homes $160,000-2 million,” then “homes over $2 million??” We need to use LOCAL data.

Brent: DOT is thinking of reopening 202 at the bridge at the bridge without any input from Greene re: 3rd land. Maybe use Greg Keene, the new PW Supervisor, to influence.

A2: Yes. Regional concern. Trails along the river on the Greene side? Conservation Commission, ALT?

A3: Great idea for the Planning Boards to meet up!

A4: Sure…but Greene doesn’t have an Economic Development Committee. Should it?

A5: Boiler plate….but….

B1: Phosphorus Exports: Done by Department of Environmental Protection, and engineers do it as part of Site Review.

Stopped at end of P. 36.

**Adjourn:** George moved to adjourn, Kevin seconded the motion, all voted in favor.

Next meeting: February 7, 2024—6:00 PM.

By Judy Marden (Scribe)